



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/396,569	09/15/1999	CORNEL IVANESCU	99-129	7625

7590

05/19/2003

MARC LORELLI CIMS 483-02-19
DAIMLERCHRYSLER INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL COR
800 CHRYSLER DRIVE EAST
AUBURN HILLS, MI 483262857

EXAMINER

TRAN, HIEN THI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1764

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/396,569

Applicant(s)

IVANESCU ET AL.

Examiner

Hien Tran

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 10 and 20-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 03 April 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya et al (5,144,800) in view of Maus et al (5,103,641).

Shioya et al disclose a catalyst system comprising: a shell with at least one conduit, e.g. 8, 9; a plurality of first catalysts 11, 12 disposed contiguous to the exhaust port of the engine and a main catalyst 13 disposed downstream of the first catalysts 11, 12.

As best understood, the apparatus of Shioya et al is substantially the same as that of the instant claims, but fails to disclose the specific shapes for the catalysts.

However, the shape of the catalysts is not considered to confer patentability to the claim. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to select an appropriate shape for the catalysts, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of a

Art Unit: 1764

component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absence showing any unexpected results. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

In any event, Maus et al discloses provision of a conically shaped catalyst 24; and a main brick catalyst 23 having an angled front face disposed downstream of said conically shaped catalyst 24 (Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate shape for the first catalyst, such as conical shape, in the apparatus of Shioya et al so as to provide a uniform oncoming flow to the upstream side of the main catalyst as taught by Maus et al.

4. Claims 4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya et al (5,144,800) in view of Maus et al (5,103,641) as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 above and further in view of Gottberg et al (5,996,339).

With respect to claim 4, Gottberg et al discloses that the angle between the rear face of the first catalyst and the angled front face of the second catalyst is acute.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to position the first and second catalysts in the apparatus of Maus et al so as the angle therebetween is acute as taught by Gottberg et al on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice and for a more effective purification thereof.

With respect to claim 8, as best understood, the apparatus of Maus et al is substantially the same as that of the instant claim, but fails to disclose whether the main brick catalyst may be ceramic.

Art Unit: 1764

However, Gottberg et al discloses a second ceramic catalyst 2 disposed downstream of a first metal catalyst 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select an appropriate material for the catalysts, such as first metal catalyst and second ceramic catalyst as taught by Gottberg et al in the apparatus of Maus et al on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice, as such is conventional in the art and no cause for patentability here.

5. Claims 11-13, 15-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya et al (5,144,800) in view of Maus et al (5,103,641), Gary (3,189,418) and GB 1,455,351.

The same comments with respect to Shioya et al and Maus et al apply.

Gary and GB patent disclose the conventionality of providing a catalyst having a front face including a plurality of angled surfaces.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a main catalyst with a front face including a plurality of angled surfaces as taught by Gary and GB patent in the modified apparatus of Shioya et al for increasing the purification effectiveness of the catalyst.

6. Claims 11-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shioya et al (5,144,800) in view of Maus et al (5,103,641), Gary (3,189,418) and GB 1,455,351 as applied to claims 11-13, 15-17 and 19 above and further in view of Gottberg et al (5,996,339).

The same comments with respect to Gottberg et al apply.

Allowable subject matter

7. Claims 10, 20-22 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 04/03/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that in Shioya et al, the catalysts 11, 12 are not contiguous to the engine as required by the instant claims. Such contention is not persuasive as Shioya et al does disclose the catalyst, e.g. 11, 12, that is disposed contiguous (next or adjacent) to the exhaust port of the engine (Fig. 1). "Contiguous" is defined in dictionary as "touching; next or adjacent to" (see attachment).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Foster, Abthoff et al are cited for showing state of the art.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hien Tran whose telephone number is 308-4253. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 308-6824. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 09/396,569

Page 6

Art Unit: 1764

HT

May 19, 20033

Hien Tran

Hien Tran

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1764



Merriam- Webster's Collegiate[®] Dictionary

TENTH EDITION

Merriam-Webster, Incorporated
Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A. ~

